Reviewer’s report

Title: Medical Education Today: All That Glitters Is Not Gold

Version: 0 Date: 10 Mar 2019

Reviewer: Win May

Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting article and offers a different perspective to what is more commonly accepted in medical education literature.

The Background and the Discussion are well-researched and written.

The author puts forward a compelling argument to support his premise, which is that biomedical sciences need to be shored up in the new integrated curricula. I do agree that the biomedical sciences should be the foundation for clinical medicine but do not totally agree with his premise that "the new curriculum is at risk of producing graduates with superior clinical expertise based on a deep grounding in biomedical science and understanding of the pathobiology of disease."

In this article, he focuses only on Pathology and its importance in undergraduate medical education rather than on all the biomedical sciences. To make the article more balanced, I would recommend that the author include other biomedical scientists, such as physiologists, anatomists, etc. to voice their opinions as well, so that the argument becomes broader. This may be more difficult but not impossible as the author is at a medical school, where all those faculty members are present.

Or it could be made even broader, if the author includes the viewpoints of clinicians and presents the article as a debate.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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